

### **Remarks**

Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 5, 11, and 15 have been amended to correct an inadvertent error in the formula for the condensates in subparagraph (b).

Claims 6, 12, and 16 have been amended to insert the inadvertently omitted "and".

### **§ 112 Rejections**

Claims 5, 11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs.

They have been amended to correct an inadvertent error in the formula for the condensates in subparagraph (b). Antecedent basis for the amendment is found at page 5, line 15, as noted by the Examiner.

In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, are rendered moot and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

### **§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Sawatsky.

In Sawatsky, an organo-functional silicone material is an adhesion-promoting material or primer to achieve a good bond between two layers. See column 3, lines 6-11, where the silicone coating is described as a "coupling coating" which promotes adhesion to a subsequent coating; column 4, lines 31-36; column 5, lines 14-19 and 29-30; column 5, line 62, through column 6, line 2; and column 8, lines 10-16. At these and other points, Sawatsky consistently teaches that the silane-containing layer is simply an adhesion-promoting layer. The protective properties desired by the reference are imparted by subsequent coatings or layers; i.e., preferably urethane coatings according to the reference.

The present invention, in contrast, uses the recited polysiloxane within the uppermost layer. It is not used as an adhesion promoting intermediate layer. See, for example, page 2, lines 20-23, and claim 1. Instead, it provides the desired durable top coat properties.

For this reason, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is overcome and applicants respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sawatsky.

As discussed above, the present invention uses a polysiloxane to improve the anti-soiling properties of protective top coat. Sawatsky teaches merely that the silane materials it discloses can be used for inter-layer adhesion promotion. There is no hint or suggestion that polysiloxanes could be applied to an uppermost protective layer to impart improved anti-soiling resistance thereto. That discovery has only been made now by Applicants.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is unobvious over Sawatsky. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over that reference is requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Casalini.

Casalini discloses a surface coated hard material, i.e., particulate which is coated with a polysiloxane. The thusly coated hard particles are used as a wear-reducing agent in lacquer coatings. According to Casalini, the polysiloxane coating prevents penetration of dyes or other colored liquids into the particles, improves wetting of the particles surface by the lacquer matrix, and improves the resistance to wear layers containing the particles.

In the present invention, the polysiloxane is applied to a substrate such as a laminate. Applicants have discovered that it provides improved anti-soiling resistance. There is no hint or suggestion in Casalini that you can obtain this property through use of polysiloxanes.

Claims 1, 9, and 13 are patentable for the reasons given above. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 12, 15, and 16 each add additional features to claims 1, 9, and 13, respectively. Thus, all pending claims are likewise patentable.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **Claims 4, 8, 10, 14, and 17**

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has deemed the subject matter of claims 4, 8, 10, 14, and 17 to be patentable. Because Applicants believe the other claims, as

amended herein, to also be patentable, these dependent claims have not been recast into independent form at this time.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. Allowance of claims 1-17, as amended, is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

July 11, 2003  
Date

By: Robert H. Jordan  
Robert H. Jordan, Reg. No.: 31,973  
Telephone No.: (651) 733-6866

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833